



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/609,279	06/30/2000	Sharat Singh	ACHBI.044.01US	2587

7590 11/23/2001

Barbara Rae-Venter Ph D  
Rae-Venter Law Group P C  
P O 60039  
Palo Alto, CA 94306

EXAMINER

FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1655

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2001

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/609,279

Applicant(s)

Singh et al

Examiner

Jeffrey Fredman

Art Unit

1655



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 24, 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 25-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1655

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restriction*

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-24 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.

### *Double Patenting*

2. Claims 1-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of copending Application No. 09/684,590. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current claims are nearly identical in scope to the claims of 09/684,590. The current claims appear to represent an overlapping genus with the claims of 09/684,590.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1655

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Neill et al (WO 98/14610).

O'Neill teaches a method of multiplex sequencing (see page 12) on nucleic acids ranging from PCR products to chromosomal DNA (necessarily greater than 2 Kb) (page 13, lines 3-6) comprising the steps:

a) combining under hybridizing conditions a target nucleic acid sequence and primer reagents (page 12, lines 16-19), where the primer reagents have (i) a first sequence part homologous to the target nucleic acid (page 8, lines 1-21) and (ii) a second sequence part homologous to a capture reagent (page 8, lines 22-30) and where each second sequence part is different (page 12, lines 2-10) and O'Neill expressly identifies the embodiment where each set has different recovery tags (page 14, line 16),

b) extending said primers duplexed with target with a polymerase in the presence of dNTPs and at least one terminator nucleotide, to add said dNTPs and said at least one terminator nucleotide to said primer reagent to extend said primer reagent with a sequence complementary to

Art Unit: 1655

the DNA target sequence to form extended primer sequences, using at least two different terminator nucleotides (page 12, lines 13-30 and page 14, lines 3-8)

c) dissociating said extended primer sequence from homologous sequences (page 16, lines 13-32 and page 13, line 28, denaturing the primed template)

d) repeating steps a)-c) (page 13, lines 17-31),

e) combining said extended primer sequences with capture reagents homologous to the capture sequence attached to a bead sequestering reagent (page 16, lines 13-33 and page 20, line 19 to page 21, line 32),

f) releasing sequentially subsets of said primer reagents by increasing the stringency conditions which may include temperature, denaturing agents, (note that going from no stringency conditions to particular conditions is a stepwise change which releases a subset of primer reagents and that page 19, lines 2-3 expressly indicate that different recovery tags may be released by different releasing procedures) (page 17, line 32 to page 20, line 18),

g) analysing by electrophoresis said extended primers to determine the sequence of said target DNA (page 32, example 3).

O'Neill expressly teaches primer reagents with identifiers such as fluorescent labels (page 15, lines 1-17) which labels affect mobility in an electrophoresis medium.

O'Neill expressly teaches the use of biotin-avidin binding pairs for capture (page 7, lines 1-6).

Art Unit: 1655

O'Neill expressly teaches hinged primers with a non-replicable moiety between the sequence parts (page 24, lines 23-33).

O'Neill expressly teaches the use of four different vessels with four different sequencing reactions with four different chain terminators (page 14, lines 9-29).

O'Neill expressly teaches the use of a strand cleaving reagent to modify, by cleavage, the primer reagents (page 19, lines 11-30).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-16, 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al (WO 98/14610) in view of Matthews et al (Anal. Biochem. 169 (1988) 1-25).

Art Unit: 1655

O'Neill teaches a method of multiplex sequencing (see page 12) on nucleic acids ranging from PCR products to chromosomal DNA (necessarily greater than 2 Kb) (page 13, lines 3-6) comprising the steps:

a) combining under hybridizing conditions a target nucleic acid sequence and primer reagents (page 12, lines 16-19), where the primer reagents have (i) a first sequence part homologous to the target nucleic acid (page 8, lines 1-21) and (ii) a second sequence part homologous to a capture reagent (page 8, lines 22-30) and where each second sequence part is different (page 12, lines 2-10) and O'Neill expressly identifies the embodiment where each set has different recovery tags (page 14, line 16),

b) extending said primers duplexed with target with a polymerase in the presence of dNTPs and at least one terminator nucleotide, to add said dNTPs and said at least one terminator nucleotide to said primer reagent to extend said primer reagent with a sequence complementary to the DNA target sequence to form extended primer sequences, using at least two different terminator nucleotides (page 12, lines 13-30 and page 14, lines 3-8)

c) dissociating said extended primer sequence from homologous sequences (page 16, lines 13-32 and page 13, line 28, denaturing the primed template)

d) repeating steps a)-c) (page 13, lines 17-31),

e) combining said extended primer sequences with capture reagents homologous to the capture sequence attached to a bead sequestering reagent (page 16, lines 13-33 and page 20, line 19 to page 21, line 32),

Art Unit: 1655

f) releasing sequentially subsets of said primer reagents by increasing the stringency conditions which may include temperature, denaturing agents, (note that going from no stringency conditions to particular conditions is a stepwise change which releases a subset of primer reagents and that page 19, lines 2-3 expressly indicate that different recovery tags may be released by different releasing procedures) (page 17, line 32 to page 20, line 18),

g) analysing by electrophoresis said extended primers to determine the sequence of said target DNA (page 32, example 3).

O'Neill expressly teaches primer reagents with identifiers such as fluorescent labels (page 15, lines 1-17) which labels affect mobility in an electrophoresis medium.

O'Neill expressly teaches the use of biotin-avidin binding pairs for capture (page 7, lines 1-6).

O'Neill expressly teaches hinged primers with a non-replicable moiety between the sequence parts (page 24, lines 23-33).

O'Neill expressly teaches the use of four different vessels with four different sequencing reactions with four different chain terminators (page 14, lines 9-29).

O'Neill expressly teaches the use of a strand cleaving reagent to modify, by cleavage, the primer reagents (page 19, lines 11-30).

O'Neill does not appear to teach the embodiment where the capture is solution based followed by binding to the solid support.



Art Unit: 1655

Matthews teaches solution hybridization followed by capture of the hybrids onto a solid support (page 17, figure 10).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize solution hybridization as taught by Matthews in the method of O'Neill since Matthews states "Solution hybridization is inherently faster than solid-phase hybridization (page 17, column 1)". An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to use solution hybridization as taught by Matthews in the method of O'Neill in order to speed up the hybridization reaction. While O'Neill does not teach multiplexing using 50 genotypes, an ordinary practitioner would have recognized, at the time of invention, that the suggestion on page 10 to multiplex the method and perform 12 different sequences represents 48 different extension reactions which is within the range of routine optimization of 50. As the court stated in *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 at 235,

More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.

An ordinary practitioner would have been able to perform routine optimization of the number of extension products to utilize the number desired.

8. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al (WO 98/14610) in view of Matthews et al (Anal. Biochem. 169 (1988) 1-25) and further in view of Koster et al (U.S. Patent 5,928,906)

Art Unit: 1655

O'Neill in view of Matthews teaches the limitations of claims 1-16 and 18-24 as discussed above. O'Neill in view of Matthews do not teach the use of nucleic acids as mobility tags.

Koster teaches the use of a variety of mobility tags for multiplexing purposes and expressly teaches modifying the lengths of nucleic acids as a mobility tag, stating “ "Multiplexing" can be achieved either by the sequence itself (composition or length) or by the introduction of mass-modifying functionalities into the primer oligonucleotide. Such multiplexing is particularly useful in conjunction with mass spectrometric DNA sequencing or mobility modified gel based fluorescence sequencing. (Column 9, lines 54-60).”

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of O'Neill in view of Matthews with the nucleic acid and mass modifying mobility modifiers of Koster since Koster teaches that these modifiers are particularly useful in multiplexing for DNA sequencing purposes.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-6568.

The examiner is normally in the office between the hours of 6:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., and telephone calls either in the early morning or the afternoon are most likely to find the examiner in the office.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152.

Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission via the P.T.O. Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The CM1 Fax Center numbers for Technology Center 1600 are either (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242. Please note that the faxing of such papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).



**Jeffrey Fredman**  
**Primary Patent Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1655**

November 19, 2001